

1 Tamie Richardson  
2 746 Bailey Drive  
3 Grants Pass OR 97527

FILED 10 SEP 14 15:42 USDC-OR

4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
5 DISTRICT OF OREGON

Tamie Richardson

Plaintiff,

vs.

First Horizon Home Loan Corp

Defendant

Case # **10-3073-CL**

**REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION  
OF TRIAL MANAGEMENT ORDER**

Dated: September 14, 2010

6  
7 **REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OF TRIAL MANAGEMENT ORDER**  
8

9 COMES NOW, Plaintiff Tamie Richardson, 746 Bailey Drive, Grants Pass, OR 97527.  
10 seeking clarification to Docket #16 TRIAL MANAGEMENT ORDER issued by this court on  
11 September 7, 2010. Plaintiff is confused with the document and the timeliness of this order  
12 and asks for clarification with regards to same.

13 In regards to Plaintiffs confusion, the document seems to offer contradictory information as to  
14 that posed in a previous ORDER from the court entered on August 9, 2010, where the case  
15 discovery timeline was given dates well into January of 2011, yet the 2 day trial as outlined in  
16 the Trial Management ORDER is asking for discovery by October 8, 2010. It is unclear what the  
17 court is requesting, and Plaintiff hereby seeks clarification.

18 Secondly, Plaintiff has read through the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure ("FCRP") relative to a  
19 Defendants response and has understood that upon Defendants answer, if a cause of action was  
20 stated upon which relief can be had, then both parties would create a case management plan to  
21 determine how discovery, and normal management of this instant case would be further  
22 determined. Once the plan was created and approved by both sides, there would be a movement  
23 to Rule 26F. Plaintiff is not aware of the rule which guides parties to follow the Trial  
24 Management Order procedure, especially not a party who is pro se. It is requested that the court



25 please offer further information as to the reasoning behind the circumvention of the previously  
26 read FCRP and ORDER timeline filed on August 9, 2010.

27 It is also requested that the court give some direction on how the Plaintiff should proceed, as to  
28 confer with all orders and rules. Plaintiff understands that the court cannot give any legal advice.

29 Lastly, please take notice, in regards to discovery, and proper parties, Plaintiff is unable, at this  
30 time, to determine who, if any, other real parties in interest may be. Plaintiff has named and  
31 properly served the one party known to Plaintiff to be culpable for the fraud committed against  
32 Plaintiff. If other parties are culpable, said parties have been hidden by the failure of said parties  
33 to properly register holder status of the security instrument with the local county recorder's  
34 office. Therefore, if the court determines that other parties should be joined, Plaintiff will  
35 certainly comply with any order by the court to join said parties as soon as the identity of said  
36 parties are fully established. Until such time as the Defendant files their answer, it would be  
37 premature and impossible for Plaintiff to know what interrogatories, admissions, depositions and  
38 discovery requests would even be appropriate.

39  
40 **Respectfully Submitted,**

41   
42 **Tamie Richardson**  
43